

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this Amendment, claims 1-20 were pending. Independent claims 1 and 13 are amended to rewrite allowable dependent claims in independent form and not to address any other issues related to patentability, with dependent claims 3, 4, and 14 being canceled. New claim 21 is added to rewrite allowable claim 8 in independent form. New claims 22-25 are added to provide additional coverage for the features of the invention. No new matter is added with support found at least in the original claims. Claims 10-12 are canceled to facilitate allowance of the application.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 13, and 15-25 remain for consideration by the Examiner.

Allowable Subject Matter

In the July 7, 2004 Office Action, claims 4, 8, and 14-20 were found to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 4 was rewritten in independent form by amending claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 4 and intervening claim 3 (with claims 3 and 4 being canceled). As a result, claim 1 and claims 2 and 5-9, which depend from claim 1, are believed in condition for allowance.

Claim 8 was rewritten in independent form with the presentation of new independent claim 21. Hence, claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 was rewritten in independent form by amending independent claim 13 to include the limitations of claim 14. After the amendment, claim 13 and claims 15-20, which depend from claim 13, are believed in condition for allowance.

New independent claim 22 is an apparatus claim that includes limitations similar to allowable claim 1 written in means-plus-function form. Note, claim 22 does not include generating an output report as called for in claim 1 but includes limitations that distinguish it from the references of record including the limitations of cancelled claims 3 and 4. Hence, claim 22 is believed in condition for allowance.

New independent claim 23 is directed to a method with limitations similar to allowable claim 13. Claim 23 differs from claim 13 in calling for the receiving

of data rather than collecting data and receiving previously identified computer system problems rather than accessing a knowledge store to obtain this data. Also, claim 23 does not include the parsing and report generating steps which are not believed necessary to distinguish the method from the references of record. Claim 23 and claim 24, which depends from claim 23, are believed in condition for allowance.

New independent claim 25 is directed to an apparatus and includes limitations similar to claim 23 written in means-plus-function form. Hence, claim 25 is believed in condition for allowance for the reasons provided for allowing claim 23.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-7, and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,738,928 ("Brown"). Claims 3 and 10-12 are canceled by this Amendment. Independent claims 1 and 13 are amended to include subject matter found allowable in the Office Action, i.e., the limitations of claims 3 and 4 and claim 14, respectively. As a result, the rejections of pending claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9, and 13 have been fully addressed, and all pending claims are allowable over Brown.

Conclusions

The references made of record but not relied upon have been reviewed but are not believed any more relevant than Brown. The pending claims are believed allowable over these additional references when considered alone or in any combination including combinations including Brown.

A check is provided for the fee associated with the addition of new claims. However, any fee deficiency associated with this submittal may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1123.

October 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



Kent A. Lembke, No. 44,866
Hogan & Hartson LLP
One Tabor Center
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500
Denver, Colorado 80202
(720) 406-5378 Tel